DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 565 CG 015 590

AUTHOR White, Michael J.
TITLE Correlates of Community Satisfaction.
PUB DATE 25 Aug 81
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (89th, Los Angeles, CA, August 24-26, 1981). Table 1 is of marginal legibility.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Characteristics; *Community Satisfaction; *Community Services; *Life Style; Multiple Regression Analysis; *Quality of Life; Questionnaires; Social Influences

ABSTRACT

Communities, defined as either physical or sociocultural entities, vary widely in reported levels of resident satisfaction. Dimensions of community characteristics were studied to assess their relative importance to resident community satisfaction. A questionnaire about various community characteristics such as social life, physical characteristics, services, and opportunities, was administered to college students (N=138) from a variety of hometowns. Results indicated that issues of maintenance and attractiveness were most important as well as service and opportunity elements. Concerns relating to social support and cohesion identified a relatively small percentage of the variance associated with community satisfaction. These results may apply, however, to relatively young, mobile, and better educated individuals from small towns. (RC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210565

Correlates of Community Satisfaction[1]

Michael J. White

Ball State University

CG 015590

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael J. White

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the 89th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles. August 25, 1981.

Correlates of Community Satisfaction[1]

Michael J. White

Ball State University

Communities -- defined as either physical or socio-cultural entities -- vary widely in reported levels of resident satisfaction (e.g., Deseran, 1975; Johnson & Knop, 1970). Although interest in the causes of this variation may be traced at least as far back as Plato's Republic, a renewal of interest is clearly evident in the recent social science literature. While the stated reasons for this interest are varied, the most important appears to be that satisfaction with one's community has a great deal to do with one's overall sense of well-being and satisfaction with life (Marans & Rodgers, 1975).

Of interest is that much of the newer research (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976) on community satisfaction breaks with traditional analyses of communities insofar as subjective perceptions of community characteristics are admitted as acceptable data. As cogently noted by Deseran (1978), the value of such an approach is that it recognizes the interpretive processes used by individuals in assessing the adequacy of their environments. While objective characteristics of the environment are real and important, ultimately an individual's satisfaction with their community and its characteristics is defined by how they have perceived these elements and compared them with past experiences and present wants (Marans & Rodgers, 1975; Wohlwill & Kohn, 1973). Because satisfaction

is necessarily a subjective experience, I have chosen to rely on resident perceptions of their communities and reported satisfaction with them as the data for this paper.

Before proceeding perhaps it will be of value to note briefly some of the several variables -- both "subjective and objective" -- which have been associated with community satisfaction. As might be expected, it has been repeatedly observed that communities providing desirable levels of social cohesion, contact, and support are viewed positively by their residents (e.g., Goudy, 1977); this appears to be true even in physically decayed urban communities (Fried & Gleicher, 1961; Gans, 1962). Some have even contended (Gans, 1968) that social interactions are the variable responsible for satisfactory community life with others being important only as they affect this process. However, no "best" level of social contact may be said to exist because there is great latitude concerning what constitutes preferred exposure to others. Lansing and Marans (1969), for example, observed that middle-class residents enjoy friendly neighbors but only if contact with them is limited.

Community characteristics reflecting either physical attributes or service functions have also received a great deal of attention. This emphasis first appeared in the work of the "Chicago school" of urban ecology (Park & Burgess, 1925; Wirth, 1938). These early orientations, however, have been stringently criticized. Currently prevailing views of the role of the physical environment in community life take a more interactionist perspective. Fisher (1976), for example, suggests that physical characteristics of the city both directly influence behavior and indirectly interact with various social and cultural processes which,

in turn, influence behavior.

Within this context several physical attributes continue to be seen as important to satisfaction with one's community. Most important seems to be how well maintained the community is (i.e., lawns mowed, trash picked up, streets kept in good condition; Lansing & Marans, 1969; Zehner, 1971). Also, issues concerning climate, taxes, noise, transportation, and housing quality and price have been identified as figuring in residents' appraisal of their neighborhood. Again, however, perception of these attributes is greatly influenced by social class and social comparison levels. Closely related to physical characteristics are services offered within the community. These have been variously defined. Marans and Rodgers (1975) have indicated the quality of public schools, police-community relations, and road maintenance to be particularly important services. More fine-grained analyses by Goudy (1977) have indicated several other functions such as utilities, fire protection, and waste disposal to also be important.

To the extent satisfaction with one's community influences the general experience of well-being, these results have both theoretical and documentary interest. However, with but few exceptions none of them are particularly surprising. The surprise, rather, lies in the small amount of substantive attention given to the relation between perceived beauty and symmetry within the community's physical form and residents' satisfaction with it as a place to live. As noted earlier, numerous studies exist which show that people find well-maintained communities to be satisfying (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell, et al., 1976; Goudy, 1977; Lansing & Marans, 1969; Marans & Rodgers, 1975; Newman & Duncan,

1979; Zehner, 1971; Zehner & Chapin, 1974). Many of these same studies also note that amount of green space, number of trees, and street congestion are salient characteristics. However, trees and clean streets are not necessarily synonymous with community attractiveness. The question of attractiveness is specifically addressed in only a few studies (e.g., Bardo, 1976; Lansing and Marans, 1969). Even here, attention is not extensive despite statistical analyses indicating it to be an important characteristic of the community.

Several lines of thought would suggest that community attractiveness would compare favorably in strength to other determinants of community satisfaction. First and obviously, the perception of beauty is by definition associated with a pleasurable response to a set of stimuli. All other things being equal, an attractive community is going to engender more positive responses than a drab one. Second, most aestheticians (Berlyne, 1974, 1977) would argue that "beautiful" forms tend to be ordered and patterned stimulus configurations. By extension, attractive cities would likely be more ordered and coherent in the stimulus patterns they present than unattractive cities (Lynch, 1960). Such perceptual clarity should serve at least three functions for the city's residents. First, it would provide clear, concise cues by which physical orientation and path-finding can be accomplished. Next, a distinct and well-formed visual environment would facilitate the utilization and exploitation of its component parts (Downs & Stea, 1973, 1977). Both of these functions should also enhance the development of the resident's perception of perceived control (Lefcourt, 1976; Rotter, 1966), as well as facilitate goal attainment within the environment. Finally, the presence of clarity in a city's

visual image may enhance symbolic representation and emotional identification with the city according to writers such as Lynch (1960) and Tuan (1974).

In this preliminary report I have addressed the following issues. First, I have sought to develop a questionnaire which incorporates in addition to more usual appraisals of community social life, physical characteristics, services, and opportunities, resident assessments of community attractiveness and physical organization. A second goal was to see how these various dimensions were associated in residents' assessments of their communities. Finally, the relative importance of these dimensions in accounting for variation in community satisfaction was tested within a multiple regression framework.

Method

Respondents. College students from undergraduate psychology and accounting classes served as respondents (n = 138; male = 50; female = 88). The mean student age was 24.2 years; ages ranged from 17 to 55. Students were from a large number of hometowns (n = 55); populations of these largely midwestern towns ranged from 316 to 2,600,000 (U.S. Census, 1980). Although the mean population was 87,450, most were much smaller; the median size was 10,250.

Procedure. Data were collected using a questionnaire distributed in class. Students, who were all freshmen or sophomores, were first asked their age and sex. They next wrote down the name of their "hometown" which was defined as "the place you tell people you are from." Students were asked to complete the questionnaire at their convenience and return

during the next class session. All responses were anonymous and voluntary.

Four sets of items (8 items per set) were included on the questionnaire. The first three sets were adapted from items originally developed by Goudy (1977) and Warren (1970). One set involved questions of social cohesion and community relations, a second set dealt with utilities and other services provided by the community, and a third set concerned opportunities for personal and cultural development. A fourth set was developed specifically to measure the degree of environmental beauty, legibility, and order residents perceived in their community's physical form. Specifically, these questions involved community attractiveness, architectural distinctiveness, and ease of direction finding. Using a 5-point Likert response format, they then rated their hometown on each item. Items were presented in random order; half of the directional weightings were reversed.

In order to measure community satisfaction, nine items comprising three scales were also presented using a similar format. These three scales (Goudy, 1977) measured the community as a place to live, community attachment, and evaluation of the community's future.

Results

Prior to analysis all data were re-coded so that a high score had a semantically affirmative meaning. No other transformations of the data were made; tests for departures of the original data characteristics from those required for meaningful analysis (Rummel, 1970) were negative. The product-moment correlation matrix is shown in Table 1 and is derived from 131 respondents retained after listwise deletion of missing values. Respondents and test questions define the data slice (Cattell, 1952) within

the R-factor analysis model used.

Insert Table 1 about here

Factors were extracted using a principal-factor procedure with the squared multiple correlation coefficient serving as the communality estimate. An orthogonal rotation was employed and identified four factors. The first three factors had eigenvalues in excess of 1.0 (Kaiser, 1960. Insofar as the fourth factor approached this eigenvalue level (.837) and contributed to extracted variance according to the scree test (Cattell, 1966) it was retained for subsequent analysis. The varimax rotated factor matrix is presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Some appreciation for the nature of the four factors may be gained by examination of Table 2. Factor I's most heavily loaded items (+.50) are those involving cultural, shopping, and educational opportunities. It also appears that residents associate visually impressive sites with the opportunities they provide. Factor II includes items defining social support and assistance. The inclusion of item ter on this factor suggests residents associate ease of giving directions with willingness to make them. Factor III is defined by items concerning the town's beauty, potential for visual satisfaction, quality of government, and maintenance. Fianlly, Factor IV, which includes one item only, concerns the heterogeneity of streets' visual appearance within the community.[2]

Multiple regression analyses were next performed using the four sets of factor scores as predictor variables. Factor scores were calculated using a complete estimation method (Nie, et al., 1979) which included a term for each variable in the analysis. The three measures of community satisfaction (community as a place to live, community attachment, and community evaluation, respectively) served as criterion variables. Respective Cronbach's alpha levels for these scales are .87, .77, and .92.

Regression analyses are summarized in Table 3. In each step-wise analysis Factors III, I, and II were signifcant ($p < .001$) determinants of the three community satisfaction scales. Factor IV also helped define variance on the community as a place to live ($p < .05$) and community evaluation ($p < .05$) scales. No significant interactions were obtained. Importantly, Factor III consistently identified most of the obtained variance (33.3%, 19.1%, and 36.1%, respectively). The other three factors never identified more than 8% of the variance, except for Factor I in the community evaluation analysis (26.2%). Betas for all of the factor/predictor variables were positive and were steepest for Factor III (.51, .37, and .52, respectively). Overall, each of the three regression equations were significant ($p < .001$) and determined 50.0%, 38.5%, and 70.9% of observed variance.

Insert Table 3 about here

Discussion

Results in some ways suggest the obvious: It is better to live in a beautiful, interesting, and friendly community than an ugly, boring and unfriendly one. Fortunately, they also prompt other conclusions.

Clearly the most important dimension determining this group of respondents' satisfaction with their hometowns was defined by Factor 3. As an evaluative dimension, Factor 3 appears to be broadly defined. Apparently a town which is "beautiful to look at" is similar to a "well-maintained and well-lit" town; distinctions between simple maintenance and aesthetics are poorly defined.

Factor 3 also accounts for an unusually high amount of the variance for each of the three measures of community satisfaction. When considering their hometowns as "places to live" and as compared to other towns (criterion variables 1 & 3), residents focused on issues of maintenance and attractiveness. However, when residents indicated how attached they were to their community, even though these elements continued to be of primary importance, the amount of identified variance was half of that observed for the previous two measures. A large amount of the community attachment variance was identified by Factor 1, a dimension comprised of service and opportunity elements.

It would be erroneous to infer that social support and cohesion were not important to these respondents; as described earlier, they were. It nonetheless is a surprise that the concerns which were incorporated by Factor 2 identify such a relatively small percentage of the variance associated with community satisfaction. However, before too much weight is given to these finds, their limits must be discussed.

First, respondents in this study were approximately five years younger than the national average (U.S. Census, 1980) and all were college students. Further, their hometowns were, by and large, fairly small. Prior, more representative samples (Campbell, et al., 1976; Marans and Rodgers, 1975) have demonstrated noticeable differences in the importance of various community characteristics across cohorts defined by age groups and by community size. The present results may thus apply only to relatively young, mobile, and better educated individuals from small towns. Certainly as a group these individuals might be hypothesized to have less interest or need of the social supports and facilities offered by their communities when compared to older, less mobile individuals.

Critics of orthogonal factor rotations may also object. Indeed, second-order oblique rotations by Bardo and Hughey (1979) on similar data indicate that certain physical and social dimensions (e.g., housing adequacy and alienation) are closely associated. And even within the present framework similar patterns on some items emerged. It is a moot question awaiting further analysis, however, if factors defined by items such as "the town being beautiful to look at" are statistically dependent on factors defining social activities and the like. On the surface, they would seem largely unrelated.

Careful scholars will also note that objective definitions of what constitutes a community (i.e., hometown) have not been addressed. Surely as one changes the level of analysis from neighborhood to community to city, the determinants of satisfaction also change (Campbell, et al., 1976). However, my concern here has been with the emergent

social reality of the resident's "hometown" (Deseran, 1978); how this overlaps with the objective parameters defining communities must await further analysis.

Although research currently under way will address many of the above limitations, those from the design professions may still be exasperated, not so much with this study, but with the whole tradition of which it is a part. Even if it can be accepted that physical attractiveness is a major element of community satisfaction, nothing in this paper nor others like it gives designers a clue as to how to achieve this end. Nor does it indicate those standards residents use to define "beautiful to look at." Identifying specifically what residents prefer must take a different path than subjective self-reportage. Of course, as an architect recently told me we may not wish to know any of this; it may be that people actually enjoy the plastic signs in front of Burger World and drive-in funeral homes.

Other investigators have sought to explain community satisfaction largely as a function of social cohesion, services provided, and various demographic characteristics. Explained variance in these studies seldom is greater than 40%; this, for example, is approximately the level obtained by Goudy (1977) in a study using nearly identical measures of community attachment. With far fewer variables, the present study determined slightly above or near this level on two measures and nearly 70% on a third measure.

Increasing precision in predicting community satisfaction has been a persistent problem. The present study, although limited by sample

size and other characteristics, would seem to indicate that the quality of the community's physical image is an important and yet largely overlooked variable. In a society that has been described as alienated, mobile, and deficient in interpersonal support, one of the ties that continues to bind the individual to his or her community may be the beauty and visual coherence found there.

Reference Note

Kaiser, H.F. Comments on communalities and the number of factors. Paper presented at Conference on the Communality Problem in Factor Analysis, St. Louis: Washington University. May 14, 1960.

References

Andrews, F. M. & Withey, S. B. Social indicators of well-being: America's perception of life quality. New York: Plenum, 1976.

Bardo, J. W. Dimensions of community satisfaction in a British town. Multivariate Experimental Clinical Research, 1976, 2, 129-134.

Bardo, J. W. & Hughey, J. B. A second-order factor analysis of community satisfaction in a midwestern city. Journal of Social Psychology, 1979, 109, 231-235.

Berlyne, D. E. (Ed.). Studies in the new experimental aesthetics: Steps towards an objective psychology of aesthetic appreciation. Washington, D. C.: Hemisphere, 1974.

Berlyne, D. E. The new experimental aesthetics and environmental psychology. In P. Suedfeld, J. A. Russell, L. M. Ward, F. Szigeti, & G. Davis (Eds.), The behavioral basis of design: Book 2, Session Summaries and papers. Stroudsburg, PA: Dowden, Hutchinson, & Ross, 1977.

Campbill, A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. The quality of American life. New York: Sage, 1976.

Cattell, R. B. The three basic factor-analytic research designs - their intercorrelations and derivatives. Psychological Bulletin, 1952, 49, 499-520.

Cattell, R. B. The Scree test for number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1, 245-276.

Deseran, F. A. Definition of community: A comparative study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1975.

Deseran, F. A. Community satisfaction as definition of the situation: Some conceptual issues. Rural Sociology, 1978, 43, 235-249.

Downs, R. M., & Stea, D. Image and environment. Chicago: Aldine, 1973.

Downs, R. M., & Stea, D. Maps in minds. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

Fisher, C. S. The metropolitan experience. In A. H. Hawley & V. P. Rock (Eds.), Metropolitan America in contemporary perspective. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Fried, M. & Gleicher, P. Some sources of residential satisfaction in an urban slum. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1961, 27, 305-315.

Gans, H. J. The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian-Americans. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Gans, H. J. People and plans. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Goudy, W. J. Evaluations of local attributes and community satisfaction in small towns. Rural Sociology, 1977, 42, 371-382.

Johnson, R. L., & Knop, E. C. Rural-urban differentials in community satisfaction. Rural Sociology, 1970, 34, 544-548.

Lansing, J. B., & Marans, R. W. Evaluation of neighborhood quality. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1969, 75, 195-199.

Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. Hillsdale, NJ: LEA, 1976.

Lynch, K. The image of the city. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960.

Marans, R. W., & Rodgers, W. R. Toward an understanding of community satisfaction. In A. H. Hawley & V. P. Rock (Eds.), Metropolitan America in contemporary perspective. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Newman, S. J., & Duncan, G. J. Residential problems, dissatisfaction, and mobility. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1979, 45, 154-166.

Park, R. E., & Burgess, E. W. The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, (Whole No. 609).

Rummel, R. J. Applied factor analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Tuan, Y. F. Topophilia. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current population reports: Population estimates and projections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Warren, R. L. The good community - what would it be? Journal of the Community Development Society, 1970, 1, 14-23.

Wirth, L. Urbanism as a way of life. American Journal of Sociology, 1938, 44, 3-24.

Wohlwill, J. F., & Kohn, I. The environment as experienced by the migrant: An adaptation - level view. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1973, 4, 135-164.

Zehner, R. B. Neighborhood and community satisfaction in new towns and less planned suburbs. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1971, 37, 379-385.

Zehner, R. B. Indicators of the quality of life in new communities. Cambridge: Ballinger, 1977.

Zehner, R. B., & Chapin, F. S., Jr. Across the city line: A white community in transition. Lexington, MA: Lexington, 1974.

Footnotes

1. Support for this paper was provided from National Science Foundation Grant DAR-8011900. I would like to thank Michael Fakinos and Gwen White for their assistance in data collection.

2. Using only those items with loadings above .50, reliability levels calculated with Cronbach's alpha are .82, .78, and .75, respectively. With only one item meeting this criterion, it is, of course, impossible to calculate this value for Factor IV. Given the method of factor score calculation used, these values are given for illustration only.

Table 1

Correlation Coefficients

	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7
V1	1.00000						
V2	0.52579	1.00000					
V3	0.16167	0.01704	1.00000				
V4	-0.25753	-0.14226	0.06413	1.00000			
V5	0.06372	0.19510	0.12904	0.13277	1.00000		
V6	0.38919	0.23220	0.12720	-0.12365	0.30823	1.00000	
V7	0.08332	0.14782	0.11119	0.22825	0.40143	0.14830	1.00000
V8	-0.21155	-0.03092	-0.01871	0.28470	0.12429	0.00622	0.34529
V9	-0.32428	0.02794	0.08540	0.37061	0.22805	0.05935	0.30908
V10	0.07095	0.09654	0.09471	0.26926	0.34408	0.15614	0.60337
V11	0.21134	0.25752	0.28792	0.22078	0.44011	0.19038	0.49874
V12	0.40435	0.28496	0.17253	0.08682	0.32651	0.32550	0.34794
V13	0.36682	0.30607	0.12376	-0.23020	-0.01475	0.43966	0.11622
V14	-0.16967	-0.03314	0.12004	0.26061	0.14078	-0.08527	0.39516
V15	-0.27612	0.04906	0.16974	0.42954	0.26280	-0.12594	0.20790
V16	-0.18340	0.10644	-0.01848	0.31106	0.16581	-0.02480	0.24507
V17	0.19071	0.27533	0.03319	0.14122	0.25709	0.19711	0.12455
V18	0.15131	-0.00459	0.10720	-0.31269	-0.05320	0.03327	-0.21315
V19	0.05081	0.03686	0.14358	0.16584	0.22348	0.08714	0.53540
V20	0.27525	0.30759	0.02858	0.01291	0.28324	0.29190	0.26384
V21	-0.40706	-0.13731	0.03648	0.44036	0.18441	-0.16000	0.13089
V22	-0.29362	0.00794	0.08098	0.51216	0.31254	-0.07216	0.29104
V23	-0.09530	0.05718	0.05548	0.20617	0.23865	0.00150	0.27382
V24	0.26757	0.32768	0.18160	0.09361	0.43778	0.29116	0.43221
V25	-0.31203	-0.10754	0.07327	0.31996	0.07897	-0.21470	0.14949
V26	-0.13187	-0.05581	-0.00400	0.36504	0.14431	0.07496	0.36526
V27	0.30316	0.37308	0.15953	0.01384	0.41881	0.28288	0.39293
V28	-0.02140	0.02474	0.10581	0.29504	0.20750	0.14708	0.23218
V29	-0.02644	0.15090	0.06867	0.15976	0.26258	0.18478	0.28032
V30	-0.12697	-0.08790	0.13645	0.31487	0.30836	0.15534	0.04686
V31	-0.11423	0.10087	-0.21287	0.17835	0.09413	0.02434	0.23168
V32	0.40325	0.19064	0.07288	0.10394	0.23136	0.20034	0.30515

Table 1 Continued

	V8	V9	V10	V11	V12	V13	V14
V1							
V2							
V3							
V4							
V5							
V6							
V7							
V8	1.00000						
V9	0.40967	1.00000					
V10	0.22379	0.27447	1.00000				
V11	0.22808	0.27881	0.35410	1.00000			
V12	0.12050	0.11391	0.32581	0.42433	1.00000		
V13	0.03286	-0.14086	0.12442	0.14996	0.29694	1.00000	
V14	0.35855	0.30542	0.34548	0.36113	0.14808	-0.02733	1.00000
V15	0.19662	0.41558	0.21808	0.24409	0.03144	-0.20092	0.31880
V16	0.22315	0.36714	0.16455	0.22179	0.15712	-0.19235	0.29374
V17	0.19954	0.24499	0.15974	0.19522	0.33314	0.12406	0.00827
V18	-0.32747	-0.21391	-0.22966	-0.14587	-0.02555	0.21251	-0.19622
V19	0.25305	0.34366	0.44727	0.28161	0.21769	0.06414	0.31667
V20	0.06794	0.10420	0.33400	0.35133	0.46712	0.25708	0.11871
V21	0.22857	0.43503	0.21419	0.19167	-0.01797	-0.31687	0.29850
V22	0.21213	0.48326	0.25491	0.24224	0.05728	-0.26424	0.28862
V23	0.24135	0.30646	0.28338	0.27456	0.16847	-0.13575	0.32010
V24	0.14892	0.28724	0.28232	0.49809	0.37193	0.04887	0.27496
V25	0.20243	0.27125	0.12203	0.12938	0.03908	-0.24694	0.30901
V26	0.32077	0.30945	0.21211	0.28852	0.20446	-0.07177	0.32727
V27	0.13734	0.13255	0.37046	0.30859	0.41849	0.27592	0.16699
V28	0.28235	0.23157	0.23114	0.34692	0.15098	-0.02883	0.24563
V29	0.24826	0.26789	0.31804	0.22981	0.02438	0.02901	0.33325
V30	0.19590	0.20898	0.11591	0.17166	0.07004	-0.09924	0.20257
V31	0.20720	0.30883	0.42630	0.05114	-0.04826	-0.12889	0.16753
V32	-0.09528	-0.11278	0.19824	0.22460	0.37122	0.21261	-0.02438

Table 1 Continued

	V15	V16	V17	V18	V19	V20	V21
V1							
V2							
V3							
V4							
V5							
V6							
V7							
V8							
V9							
V10							
V11							
V12							
V13							
V14							
V15	1.00000						
V16	0.31281	1.00000					
V17	0.14974	0.14276	1.00000				
V18	-0.28177	-0.13229	-0.11263	1.00000			
V19	0.17748	0.16432	0.16253	-0.13175	1.00000		
V20	0.06786	0.09105	0.18660	-0.11116	0.29171	1.00000	
V21	0.52542	0.28989	0.05839	-0.19165	0.14478	0.02336	1.00000
V22	0.56260	0.34359	0.26806	-0.18358	0.17445	0.06860	0.54098
V23	0.29457	0.29552	0.16504	-0.15557	0.30008	0.21412	0.40427
V24	0.25402	0.25515	0.18741	-0.05274	0.26635	0.21066	0.12514
V25	0.35894	0.33009	0.06882	-0.22879	0.06751	-0.04716	0.39153
V26	0.30904	0.25252	0.10602	-0.13716	0.28589	0.07705	0.38708
V27	0.08853	0.06065	0.37106	-0.01218	0.33993	0.27244	-0.02584
V28	0.26256	0.15445	0.19850	-0.19877	0.19872	0.15218	0.33016
V29	0.26169	0.08504	0.04642	-0.16735	0.21805	0.29977	0.22124
V30	0.37663	0.13335	0.15242	-0.19784	0.05698	0.19414	0.28278
V31	0.08888	0.17080	0.04868	-0.33474	0.17439	0.05548	0.12163
V32	-0.00811	-0.13785	0.19562	0.03489	0.20643	0.35984	-0.11254

Table 1 Continued

	V22	V23	V24	V25	V26	V27	V28
V1							
V2							
V3							
V4							
V5							
V6							
V7							
V8							
V9							
V10							
V11							
V12							
V13							
V14							
V15							
V16							
V17							
V18							
V19							
V20							
V21							
V22	1.00000						
V23	0.23562	1.00000					
V24	0.26000	0.30971	1.00000				
V25	0.36893	0.23779	-0.00834	1.00000			
V26	0.29791	0.25037	0.17011	0.25682	1.00000		
V27	0.07830	0.15062	0.35998	-0.07938	0.10508	1.00000	
V28	0.31648	0.33250	0.27927	0.21780	0.53778	0.11579	1.00000
V29	0.23142	0.15898	0.14657	0.10934	0.20443	0.17711	0.22155
V30	0.46506	0.19253	0.18367	0.31760	0.18426	0.05501	0.30138
V31	0.21202	0.10392	0.07292	0.12518	0.09391	0.17021	0.20909
V32	0.07894	0.04180	0.19321	-0.17171	0.04517	0.25015	0.02768

Table 1 Continued

	V29	V30	V31	V32
V1				
V2				
V3				
V4				
V5				
V6				
V7				
V8				
V9				
V10				
V11				
V12				
V13				
V14				
V15				
V16				
V17				
V18				
V19				
V20				
V21				
V22				
V23				
V24				
V25				
V26				
V27				
V28				
V29	1.00000			
V30	0.15988	1.00000		
V31	0.28336	-0.01494	1.00000	
V32	0.10440	0.02008	-0.06584	1.00000

Table 2

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

Items [a,b] (My hometown or In my hometown:)		Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV
30.	Has good educational opportunities	(.55)	.13	-.02	-.09
25.	Has good health care facilities	(.51)	-.19	.16	.01
23.	Has good cultural opportunities	(.77)	.08	.09	.09
21.	Has good shopping facilities	(.68)	-.16	.19	.00
15.	Has good employment opportunities	(.69)	.03	.13	-.01
9.	Would (or does) welcome diverse ethnic groups	(.54)	.05	.31	.20
4.	Has places that would "stick out" in the mind of even a newcomer	(.57)	-.06	.22	.06
16.	Has good programs for the elderly	(.43)	.03	.20	.09
28.	Has good programs and activities for youth	(.41)	.16	.27	-.00
1.	Residents know each other	-.39	(.67)	-.09	-.13
2.	Residents help each other	-.06	(.60)	-.07	.14
6.	It is easy to give clear and unconfusing directions to strangers	-.09	(.55)	.02	-.02
12.	People usually have a sense of belonging	.05	(.61)	.25	-.17
24.	Residents participate in community affairs	.26	(.50)	.25	-.09
27.	Residents feel "in control" of things	.02	(.58)	.26	.08
5.	People understand how to "get things done"	.33	(.48)	.17	-.01
11.	Residents have pride in the community	.28	(.46)	.41	-.18
13.	It would be easy for me to draw an accurate map of my hometown	-.37	(.43)	.09	-.12
17.	Power to make decisions is shared among residents	.25	(.44)	-.02	.08
20.	People have many friends	.05	(.52)	.21	.02
32.	It is easy even for new residents to form "pictures" of my hometown	-.08	(.47)	.11	-.12
10.	Is beautiful to look at	.16	.32	(.57)	.24
7.	Residents feel good when they think how my town looks	.14	.33	(.72)	.05
14.	Has good government	.32	.01	(.55)	.03
19.	Has good street lighting and maintenance	.11	.22	(.57)	.03
8.	Has good police protection	.30	.00	(.41)	.15
26.	Has good recreational opportunities	.39	.03	(.40)	-.07
31.	Many streets look alike	.13	.04	.26	(.77)
	Percent Total Variance	19.1	11.2	3.6	2.5
	Percent Common Variance	50.9	28.1	11.4	9.6

[a] Items with an absolute loading value of less than .40 have been omitted. Numbering follows from Table 1.

[b] A complete list of items may be obtained from the author.

Table 3

Regression Analyses

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Increase	Beta	F Ratio for Increase in R^2
Criterion Variable: Community as a Place to Live					
Factor 3	.577	.333	.333	.577	61.447***
Factor 1	.637	.406	.073	.271	14.925***
Factor 2	.676	.457	.051	.228	11.431***
Factor 4	.696	.484	.027	.165	6.259*
Factor 1x2	.701	.491	.007	-.088	1.677
Factor 1x4	.703	.494	.003	-.054	.626
Factor 1x3	.704	.495	.001	-.038	.325
Factor 2x4	.704	.495	.000	-.009	.017
Factor 2x3	a	a	a	a	a
Criterion Variable: Community Attachment					
Factor 3	.437	.191	.191	.437	28.972***
Factor 1	.518	.268	.077	.159	12.915***
Factor 2	.576	.332	.064	.254	11.577***
Factor 4	.593	.352	.020	.141	3.636
Factor 1x3	.608	.370	.018	-.139	3.480
Factor 2x3	.615	.378	.008	.090	1.458
Factor 1x2	.619	.383	.005	-.079	0.983
Factor 2x4	.620	.385	.002	-.046	0.366
Factor 1x4	a	a	a	a	a
Criterion Variable: Community Evaluation					
Factor 3	.601	.361	.361	.601	69.509***
Factor 1	.790	.623	.263	.515	85.062***
Factor 2	.828	.685	.062	.250	23.820***
Factor 4	.838	.703	.018	.131	6.87 **
Factor 1x2	.840	.705	.002	-.056	1.176
Factor 1x4	.842	.708	.003	.055	1.140
Factor 2x3	.842	.709	.001	.035	.433
Factor 1x3	.843	.710	.001	-.022	.177
Factor 2x4	a	a	a	a	a

*** $p < .001$
** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$
a Calculation terminated: $F < .01$